

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

June 1, 2005

LB 71A, 645

you drew and not something you read from a court opinion?

SPEAKER BRASHEAR: Yes. I'm arguing the case law in the light most favorable to my circumstance.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then would you object to doing away with A bills?

SPEAKER BRASHEAR: I wouldn't, but our rules would unless we revise our rules.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, we can change the rules.

SPEAKER BRASHEAR: Certainly, we can.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And we would, thereby, save a lot of time and a lot of money and a lot of paper by having a second procedure related to A bills when they're not even necessary.

SPEAKER BRASHEAR: I agree with the point you're making.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, with that...with people accepting that then I don't care where they got this information...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: (Visitors and doctor of the day introduced.) On with discussion. Senator Don Pederson, followed by Senator Chambers. Senator Pederson.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. Senator Chambers has some very good thoughts in this connection. I think we have a longstanding tradition of having A bills to carry out the intent of a particular bill and to fund it. It so happens that in this particular case they've come up with an amendment that will require funding. Now the problem is, how do you find an appropriate A bill to carry out the funding of this? There's been the suggestion that we could use another bill like LB 71A and attach it into that. But the